

David Hilferty
Nebraska Wheat Growers Association
before
the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee
Farm Bill Regional Hearing
Grand Island, Nebraska
August 16, 2006

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is David Hilferty. I am a wheat farmer from Grant, Nebraska. I live and farm in Perkins County, which is located in southwestern Nebraska. My farm is in its fifth consecutive year of a moderate to severe drought. A good deal of my testimony will deal with how farmers in drought conditions are affected by the 2002 Farm Bill. I thank you for this opportunity to discuss wheat growers' concerns about the current Farm Bill and our thoughts on the 2007 Farm Bill.


Effective farm legislation is essential, not only for wheat growers, but also for rural economies and American consumers. Farm programs were designed to cushion the boom and bust cycles that are inherent to agricultural production and to ensure a consistently safe, affordable and abundant food supply for the American people.

The 2002 Farm Bill has strong points, and the wheat growers that I represent here today believe that the next Farm Bill should build on these strengths. But, while wheat growers generally support current policy, much of the "safety net" provided by the 2002 bill has not been effective for wheat farmers.

Since 2002, wheat growers have received little or no benefit from two key components of the current bill, the counter cyclical program and loan deficiency payment program, for two main reasons. First, severe weather conditions for several consecutive years in many wheat states have led to significantly lower yields or total failure. These extremely low yields have lowered APHs to a point that insurance becomes less of a safety net. The loan program and the LDP are useless when you have no crop. Secondly, the target price on the counter cyclical program for wheat was set considerably lower than market conditions indicated, and severe weather conditions in some areas have created a short crop, which has led to higher prices in other areas. As a result, there has been very little support in the form of counter cyclical payments.

As you can see by the chart in my testimony, the support level for wheat compared to other commodities for the 2002 to 2005 (estimated) crop years, even as a percentage of production costs, is relatively low.

	Wheat	Soybean	Corn	Cotton	Rice
AVG CCC/Acre '02-'05E	\$19.71	\$20.67	\$40.68	\$216.38	\$308.87
AVG Production Costs/acre '02-'05E	\$192.64	\$245.25	\$362.61	\$513.81	\$638.76
AVG CCC to Production costs (%)	10.25%	8.63%	10.99%	41.68%	49.42%



Source for CCC outlays, years 2001 to 2005 (estimated)
<http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/agoutlook/aotables/2006/03Mar/aotab35.xls>
 Sources for production costs/acre: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/CostsandReturns/testpick.htm>

I am not, in any way, suggesting that other crops receive too much support – far from it, they face the same problems our growers face and rely heavily on this safety net. We are simply stating that wheat producers need a viable safety net also. There is no doubt that America's farmers would rather depend on the markets than the government for their livelihoods, but the current economic and trade environments do not offer a level playing field in the global marketplace. Many of our trading partners support their farmers at a much higher rate than in the U.S. At the same time, we face continually increasing production and transportation costs. Fuel and fertilizer prices are up an estimated 24 to 27 percent for wheat growers just from last year, as estimated in a recent FAPRI report, and the current disaster situation, including droughts, floods and fires, has been especially troubling for our members.

These issues, along with potential changes in the World Trade Organization rules, have led the wheat growers to begin looking at other options for the 2007 bill. While we are not currently committed to any one proposal, we are analyzing the effects of making minor changes to program components.

For instance, we are examining the impact of increasing the direct payment. This component provides the most reliable cash flow of all program components and, as such, greatly aids in securing operating credit. We are also studying the effects of increasing the target price to be more aligned with today's market conditions while leaving the current structure of the loan program as is. Another concept involves altering the counter cyclical program to be based on revenue rather than price alone. I expect our full board will be looking closely at the effects of these options and others in the near future and will soon be recommending specific proposals.

Also, wheat growers would like to see the conservation programs continue as presently authorized, but with full funding, and we would like to explore opportunities to streamline program sign-up to be less time consuming and more producer friendly. We also believe strongly in the pursuit of renewable energy from agricultural sources and support additional

incentives for further research and development of renewable energy initiatives, specifically cellulosic ethanol.

Thank you for this opportunity. I am ready to answer any questions you may have.